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Reviewer's report:

This paper has been considerably improved by its revisions. However there remain an number of problems. If these are not fixed this paper should not be published. I personally think this would be a pity as there are interesting findings here, I just feel this paper is not written yet as 'science' although it is now heading in that direction.

The Abstract - this doesn't actually reflect the findings of the paper, nor its conclusions. The results and discussion sections needs to be redrafted to reflect the results and conclusions in a considered way.

Response – this has been changed

Discussion - the limitations section should be in the discussion
Response – done

The discussion of the study findings is much too heavily infused by the personal opinion of the authors. The authors clearly expected that the number of people involved in Stepping Stones (which I imagine was 1 in 30 if the adult village
population - is that right) would be enough for 'village level' transformation. Why
do they expect this? what is the scientific basis for expecting a 1 in 30 ratio is
reasonable (rather than a 1 in 10 or 1 in 10 or 1 in 5). If they are to make
judgements these must be evidence based. If they can't cite other authors on this
issue they need to rather discuss it as a matter for reflection and further
research. The same applies for expected attitude and knowledge change. Afterall
in schools most learners only get 60% or less on exams - what's the basis for
expecting 100% change in knowledge from an intervention like Stepping Stones.
there is a complex literature on attitude change - how it is obtained and so forth.
This isn't engaged with.

Overall I would like to see the paper revised again and the authors must engage
with the theoretical literature on behaviour change if they are to make a scientific
contribution to this area of knowledge (which is what they are trying to do).

Response – the discussion has been extensively changed, incorporating the
above comments. One point – I don't think we say that we expect 100% change,
but we think that some of the critical aspects of HIV prevention should be known
by participants, for example that it is sexually transmitted and that condoms can
protect.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely
related research interests
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being
published – Corrections made
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a
statistician.
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